



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

are illustrated by copious examples from Horace himself and from other Latin writers. In the discussion of moot points the editor assumes a didactic tone, which is at times somewhat aggravating, and is not well suited to a critical edition. On ii. 5. 39, for example, he says of *rubra*, in the sentence "seu rubra Canicula findet Infantis statuas," "elle convient pour indiquer, non la couleur de l'astre, mais la chaleur de l'été." Against the passages which M. Lejay cites in favor of this view, none of which refers to *canicula*, and only the first of which is at all pertinent, may be set Sen. *N.Q.* i. 1. 7, "cum . . . acrior sit caniculae rubor, Martis remissior," and Schol. Bern. in *Germ. Arat.* p. 237. 6, Breysig; while against the casual reference in Blümner's *Farbenbezeichnungen* may be placed the detailed investigation of See in *Astronomy and Astro-Physics* XI (Northfield, Minn., 1902; cf. *TAPA*. XXXIV, lix). It seems within the range of possibility, to say the least, that Horace called Sirius red because it was red.

The edition is on the whole an excellent one, full of valuable material and suggestions, which must be taken account of by all serious students of the *Satires*.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Auli Persii Flacci Saturaे. Edidit atque prolegomenis, interpretatione Belgica, commentario instruxit JACOBUS VAN WAGENINGEN. Partes duae. Pars prior, pp. lxiii+48; pars altera, pp. 129.

This scholarly edition based upon the text of Leo's recent revision of the standard Jahn-Bücheler text will be welcomed by all students of Persius. In the commentary Van Wageningen invites careful comparison with the well-known edition of Némethy, Budapest, 1903, while in the prolegomena we have a convenient summary of the most recent studies in the language, philosophy, and literary art of Persius.

This prolegomena, which shows the results of careful assimilation, skilful arrangement, and independent judgment and research, is worthy of all praise. After a brief discussion *De origine saturaे*, pp. vi-x, in which far too scant notice is paid to the theories of Leo and Hendrickson, there follows a section *De Persii exemplis*, pp. xi-xxiv. The two tables of parallels for Horace, and for Catullus, Virgil, and Ovid are useful. A similar table should have been prepared for Lucilius; cf. my paper on "Lucilius and Persius," *Trans. Am. Phil. S.* XL, 121-50. In the table of Horatian reminiscences Van Wageningen seems to me over-cautious. In an author whose diction is so steeped in Horace it seems better to follow Némethy's procedure of quoting all possible parallels that the reader may have the evidence to discriminate between direct imitation, free adaptation, and mere coincidence. Chap. iii, pp. xxv-xxxvi, *De sermone Persiano*, on the lexicography, syntax, and diction of Persius is excellent. The growing influence of the

sermo popularis in Persius in contrast with Horatian satire is clearly indicated. It may be added that this is in part a reversion to the standard of Lucilius. I miss on p. xxvi the statement that the use of the personal pronoun as subject is characteristic of the *sermo popularis*. Also under p. xxvi, par. 4, *De verbo*, it would be well to add references on the usage of *simplex pro composito*. Again on p. xxxi Persius' habit of modifying an adjective used as a substantive by another adjective might be cited, e.g., *mordaci vero*, i. 107; *generoso honesto*, ii. 74; *opimum pingue*, iii. 32. Pp. xxxvii–xlv on the hexameter of Persius are good; v *De Persii saturarum indole atque natura*, pp. xlvi–xlviii; and vi *De Persii doctrina stoica*, pp. xlix–li, are over-brief but satisfactory. Apparently Geffcken's articles on Greek satire ("Studien zur griechischen Satire," *N.J.Kl.A.* XIV 6, pp. 393–411, and XIV 7, pp. 469–93) appeared too late for consideration. Should not Persius' exceptional gift for minute characterization be illustrated in the former chapter? Gildersleeve's introduction would have been especially helpful here. It seems strange that this incisive and stimulating edition is unknown to Van Wageningen. vii *De Persio aliorum exemplo*, pp. lii–lx, contains a list of the few Persian echoes in Juvenal and Martial, based on the studies of Manitius and E. Wagner. This is followed by a table of the more numerous imitations in Lactantius, Jerome, Augustine, Ausonius, and the *testimonia* upon Persius in the *grammatici* and the ancient scholastic commentators.

I turn next to the text, which is essentially that of Leo. Although all deviations from Leo's text are noted in the commentary, it would have been well to print a complete list on p. lxiii. In certain cases, as for instance in i. 69, *videmus* for *docemus*, iii. 93, *rogabit* for *rogavit*, v. 17, *bullatis* (clearly required by *turgescit*) for *pullatis*, v. 104, *veri* for *veris*, such deviation has the support of MSS authority, and clearly results in a better text. In other places, however, where the traditional text affords slight difficulties of interpretation or where the MSS tradition is divided Van Wageningen turns too readily to conjectural emendation; e.g. *scribimus inclusus numeris*, i. 13, for *scribimus inclusi* of the MSS evidently modeled on Horace *Ep. ii. 1. 117*; *versiculis* for *auriculis* in i. 23 (if we are to emend Madwig's *articulis* adopted by Némethy) is much more pointed; and in i. 67, *sive* for *sive*.

In i. 74, as Gildersleeve points out, the reading *cum* in connection with *terens* is better than *quem*. In v. 90, *veteravit* though not elsewhere attested may be a plebeianism, or even a plebeianism deliberately manufactured by Persius for the mouth of the newly made freedman, "forbidden" instead of "forbade". In v. 109, it seems needless to follow Leo in emending *adstringas* to *ut stringas*, for surely there is no difficulty in conversation in following a question of fact by a question of potentiality. In iv. 48, although *amarum* has the MSS authority and is rightly defended by Némethy, who compares Horace *Sat. 1, 2. 68–71* and paraphrases by *irritabilis*, Van Wageningen

wrongly prefers *amorum* from John of Salisbury. I should add a reference to Persius vi. 72, *morosa vena* where *morosa* seems to be used in the same sense of *irritabilis* rather than of *fastidiosus*. The limitations of space preclude the discussion of a fuller selection from my marginalia.

I can only notice the commentary briefly. In general, though the passages for annotation are chosen with discrimination, the commentary is less exhaustive than that of Némethy, and perhaps affords a more limited opportunity for judging the place of Persius in the development of satire as a literary form. Horatian parallels should have been quoted in larger number, as I have indicated above. Especially in Satire I and Satire V, 1-20, the vital part played by Horace's *Ars poetica* in molding the literary ideals and expression of Persius should be more clearly indicated. On the other hand, the full citations of the best modern handbooks on Roman life and morals are a feature of this commentary, which is especially well adapted to what we may call the study of the external life depicted in Roman satire. In several places also we have fuller restatements of old interpretations latterly discarded, which will commend themselves to students of Persius. Thus in i. 134, *edictum* is rightly explained as the play-bill rather than the praetor's edict. In ii. 68, *haec* is rightly referred to *pulpa*. In iii. 105, the interpretation of *porta* as the house door seems correct. In vi. 51, however, I doubt the interpretation of *exossatus*. Gildersleeve's note contains the best statement of the difficulties involved in the interpretation of this vexed passage. I regret that I am not competent to criticize the Dutch translation. Students of Persius are to be congratulated in having in the editions of Némethy and Van Wageningen two scholarly and individual commentaries which admirably supplement each other. The clearness of the Latin of the prolegomena and commentary are worthy of the best traditions of Dutch scholarship.

GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

De C. Maecenatis Fragmentis. By PAULUS LUNDERSTEDT. [Commentationes Philologae Ienenses, Vol. IX, Fasc. 2.] Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. 119. M. 5.

The time seems destined to come when every Roman writer, no matter how scant his literary legacy, will find somebody to compose a $\muέγα \betaιβλίον$ about him. Nor can we see any great evil in this, provided the big book is not duplicated every few years with insignificant changes. Herr Lunderstedt lists so many who have collected and commented on the fragments of Maecenas that he finds it necessary to justify himself for increasing the bibliography. The work of Harder, his chief predecessor, *Ueber die Fragmente des Maecenas*, would, it seems, have sufficed the philological world, had he added something "de genere dicendi similibusque rebus," and "not been unfor-